UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

DANIEL LAMONT WILLIAMS)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 3:14-1812
)	Judge Sharp/Knowles
WARDEN WAYNE CARPENTER, et al.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The undersigned previously entered an Order on October 5, 2015 (Docket Entry No. 60), requiring Plaintiff to file with the Court a written explanation showing cause for his failure to serve defendants, Andrew Heroux, f/n/u Hinkle, and f/n/u Caldwell, within 120 days after the filing of the Complaint pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m). The Order required Plaintiff to file such explanation within twenty (20) days of the date of entry of the Order, and it also stated in pertinent part, "If Plaintiff fails to comply with the provisions of this Order, the undersigned will recommend that this action be dismissed without prejudice."

As of the date of the filing of this Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's previous Order. The Court also notes that the Order entered on September 30, 2015 (Docket No. 58) and the undersigned's Order entered October 5, 2015 (Docket No. 60), were returned to the Clerk's Office as Undeliverable and "Return to Sender". According to the Order entered by the Honorable Kevin H. Sharp on December 4, 2014 (Docket No. 9), "He is also forewarned that his prosecution of this action will be jeopardized should he fail to keep the Clerk's Office informed of his current address." Therefore, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any party has fourteen (14)

days after service of this Report and Recommendation in which to file any written objections to this Recommendation with the District Court. Any party opposing said objections shall have fourteen (14) days after service of any objections filed to this Report in which to file any response to said objections. Failure to file specific objections within fourteen (14) days of service of this Report and Recommendation can constitute a waiver of further appeal of this Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn,* 474 U.S. 140, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985), *reh'g denied,* 474 U.S. 111 (1986); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

E. CLIFTON KNOWLE

United States Magistrate Judge